

TO QUANTIZE OR NOT TO QUANTIZE GRAVITY ?

AFSAR ABBAS

Institute of Physics, Bhubaneswar-751005, India
(e-mail : afsar@iopb.res.in)

Abstract

It is shown here that the Standard Model (SM) of particle physics supports the view that gravity need not be quantized. It is shown that the SM gives a consistent description of the origin of the universe. It is suggested that the universe came into existence when the SM symmetry was broken spontaneously. This brings out a complete and consistent model of the physical universe in the framework of a "semiclassical quantum gravity" theory.

To quantize or not to quantize gravity, is one of the outstanding questions facing physics today. Though there is still no compelling empirical evidence supporting quantization, the current theoretical prejudice is strongly in favour of the latter possibility. Here it shall however be shown that the most successful model of particle physics, the so-called Standard Model (SM), supports the former view and infact gives a consistent and complete basis for the " semiclassical quantum gravity " idea of Rosenfeld [1].

As the universe expands, it is predicted that it undergoes a series of phase transitions [2] during which the appropriate symmetry breaks down in various stages until it reaches the stage of the SM symmetry $SU(3)_c \otimes SU(2)_L \otimes U(1)_Y$. After $t \sim 10^{-10}$ seconds (at $T \sim 10^2$ GeV) the SM phase transition to $SU(3)_c \otimes U(1)_{em}$ through the Higgs Mechanism takes place.

The SM has been well studied in the laboratory. It is the best tested model of particle physics [3]. It was however believed earlier that a weakness of the SM was that the electric charge was not quantized in it. However, it was as late as 1990 that this was shown to be wrong. Against all expectations, the electric charge was shown to be fully and consistently quantized in the SM [4].

It was shown by the author [4,5] that in SM $SU(N_C) \otimes SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$ for $N_C = 3$, spontaneous symmetry breaking by a Higgs isospin doublet of weak hypercharge Y_ϕ , the isospin -1/2 component develops the vacuum expectation value $\langle \phi \rangle_0$. This fixes 'b' in the electric charge definition $Q = T_3 + bY$ to give

$$Q = T_3 + \frac{1}{2Y_\phi}Y \quad (1)$$

where Y is the hypercharge for doublets and singlets for a single generation. For each generation renormalizability through triangular anomaly cancellation and the requirement of the identity of L- and R-handed charges in $U(1)_{em}$ one finds that all unknown hypercharges are proportional to Y_ϕ . Hence correct charges (for $N_C = 3$) fall through as below [4-8]

$$Q(u) = \frac{1}{2}(1 + \frac{1}{N_C}) \quad (2)$$

$$Q(d) = \frac{1}{2}(-1 + \frac{1}{N_C}) \quad (3)$$

$$Q(e) = -1 \quad (4)$$

$$Q(\nu) = 0 \quad (5)$$

Hence the electric charge is quantized in SM. The complete structure of the SM as is, is required to obtain this result on very general grounds.

Clearly the $U(1)_{em}$ symmetry which arose due to spontaneous symmetry breaking due to a Higgs doublet in the SM symmetry will be lost above T_c^{SM} whence $SU(2)_L \otimes U(1)_{em}$ symmetry would be restored. As is obvious, above T_c^{SM} all the fermions and gauge bosons becomes massless. Here I point out a new phenomenon arising from the restoring of the full SM symmetry .

Note that to start with the parameter b and Y in the definition of electric charge were completely unknown. We could lay a handle on 'b' entirely on the basis of the presence of spontaneous symmetry breaking and on ensuring that photon was massless $b = \frac{1}{2Y_\phi}$. Above T_c^{SM} where the SM symmetry is restored there is no spontaneous symmetry breaking and hence the parameter b is completely undetermined. Together 'bY' could be any arbitrary number whatsoever even an irrational number. Within the framework of this model above T_c^{SM} we just cannot define electric charges at all. Hence the electric charge loses any physical meaning all together. There is no such thing as charge anymore. The photon (which was a linear combination of W^0 and B_μ after spontaneous symmetry breaking), with it's defining vector characteristic, does not exist either. So the conclusion is that there is no electrodynamics above T_c^{SM} . Maxwells equations of electrodynamics show that light is an electromagnetic phenomenon. Hence above the SM phase transition there was no light and no Maxwells equations. And surprisingly we are led to conclude that there was no velocity of light c as well. One knows that the velocity of light c is given as

$$c^2 = \frac{1}{\epsilon_0 \mu_0} \quad (6)$$

where ϵ_0 and μ_0 are permittivity and permeability of the free space. These electromagnetic properties disappear along with the electric charge and hence the velocity of light also disappears above the SM phase transition.

The premise on which the theory of relativity is based is that c , the velocity of light is always the same, no matter from which frame of reference it is measured. Of fundamental significance is the invariant interval

$$s^2 = (ct)^2 - x^2 - y^2 - z^2 \quad (7)$$

Here the constant c provides us with a means of defining time in terms of spatial separation and vice versa through $l = c t$. this enables one to visualize time as the fourth dimension. Hence time gets defined due to the constant c . Therefore when there were no c as in the early universe ,there was no time as well. As the special theory of relativity depends upon c and time, above the SM breaking scale there was no special theory of relativity. As the General Theory of relativity also requires the concept of a physical space-time, it collapses too above the SM breaking scale. Hence the whole physical universe collapses above this scale.

Therefore it was hypothesized that the Universe came into existence when the SM symmetry was broken spontaneously [11]. Before it there was no 'time', no 'light', no maximum velocity like ' c ', no gravity or space-time structure on which objective physical laws as we know it could exist [11].

In short we find that the SM of particle physics is not only good to explain all known facts, it is also capable of giving a natural and consistent description of the origin of the Universe [11].

So matter (which is quantized) and the space-time (and so gravity) are bound together holistically. In this picture one cannot talk of matter without spacetime and neither can we talk of space-time without matter. They are two sides of the same coin and hence the Einstein's equation as per the SM should read as follows:

$$G_{\mu\nu} = 8\pi G \langle \phi | T_{\mu\nu} | \phi \rangle \quad (8)$$

This is the " semiclassical quantum gravity " approach of Rosenfeld [1]. However here ϕ represents the complete matter degrees of freedom incorporated in the SM in terms of the three generations of matter particles plus the gauge particle of the SM (no other spurious model is needed [9,10]). Gravity, a property of the spacetime arises as a result of the quantum mechanical SM phase transtion and is not quantized. Hence as per the SM origin of the universe scenario presented here we get a complete and consistent picture of the origin and the existence of space-time and matter. The two are inseparably connected.

It seems that the reason that inspite of rigourous efforts we have not seen graviton so far is because as shown here it does not exist. This need not shock

some modern adherents of quantization of gravity as many a scientists have been warning against an urge to quantize gravity. Long ago Rosenfeld [1] had pointed out that empirical evidence and not logic forces us to quantize fields. He said that in the absence of such evidence the temptation to quantize fields must be resisted [1]. Indeed this is what the SM of particle physics is telling us. And this is within the framework of the most successful model of particle physics. Not only can the SM of particle physics provide a good description of all known particles, it also has the capacity to give a consistent picture of the origin of the universe and also of settling the issue of whether to quantize gravity or not.

REFERENCES m

1. L. Rosenfeld, *Nucl. Phys.* , **40** (1963) 353
2. E. W. Kolb and M. S. Turner, " The Early Universe " Edison Wesley, New York (1990)
3. T. P. Cheng and L. F. Lee, " Gauge Theory of Elementary Particle Physics ", Clarendon Press, Oxford (1988)
4. A. Abbas, *Phys. Lett.* , **B 238** (1990) 344
5. A. Abbas, *J. Phys. G.* , **16** (1990) L163
6. A. Abbas, *Nuovo Cimento* , **A 106** (1993) 985
7. A. Abbas, *Hadronic J.*, **15** (1992) 475
8. A. Abbas, *Ind. J. Phys.*, **A 67** (1993) 541
9. A. Abbas, *Physics Today* (July 1999) p.81-82
10. A. Abbas, 'On standard model Higgs and superstring theories' "Particles, Strings and Cosmology PASCOS99", Ed K Cheung, J F Gunion and S Mrenna, World Scientific, Singapore (2000) 123
11. A. Abbas, " On the Origin of the Universe ", *Spacetime & Substance, Int Phys Journal*, **2 (7)** (2001) 49 ; Website: spacetime.narod.ru/2-7-2001.html